

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ELIZABETH GRANT; GRACE GRANT,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICE;  
ELMHURST GENERAL HOSPITAL; DEPT.  
OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE;  
ASPCA; NICOLETTA CAFFERI; EDMOND  
GRANT; MEARA CHU MARUF MIRZA;  
ELIZABETH BRANDLER; ERIN  
SOUTERWATE; JUDGE ZARA; STEPHANIE  
ZOO,

Defendants.

22-CV-0891 (LTS)

TRANSFER ORDER

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Grace Grant, who reside in East Elmhurst (Queens County), New York bring this action *pro se*. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated their rights in Queens County, New York. For the following reasons, the Court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

**DISCUSSION**

Under the general venue provision, a federal civil action may be brought in:

(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred . . . ; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). For venue purposes, a “natural person” resides in the district where the person is domiciled. § 1391(c)(1).

For venue purposes, a defendant corporation generally resides “in any judicial district in which such defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to the civil action in question . . . .” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(2). Where a state has more than one judicial district, a defendant corporation generally “shall be deemed to reside in any district in that State within which its contacts would be sufficient to subject it to personal jurisdiction if that district were a separate State.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(d).<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiffs sue: (1) Adult Protective Services, an agency of the New York City Human Resources Administration, Department of Social Services, which has offices in each of the five boroughs, including Queens County where Plaintiffs reside;<sup>2</sup> (2) the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and (3) the New York City Police Department, both of which are agencies of the City of New York; (4) the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), which is headquartered in Manhattan; (5) Elmhurst General Hospital, which is located in Queens County; (6) Queens County Assistant District Attorney Nicoleta Cafferri; and (7) Queens County Supreme Court Justice Zara. Plaintiffs allege that the events that are the basis of their claims occurred in East Elmhurst, New York, in Queens County, which is located in the Eastern District of New York. *See* § 112(c). And the City of New York resides in this judicial district as well as in the Eastern District of New York. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 112(b), (c). Thus, while this Court may be an appropriate venue for this action, it is clear that the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York is a proper venue for this action. *See* §§ 112(c), 1391(b)(2).

---

<sup>1</sup> In a state with multiple districts, if there is no such district, “the corporation shall be deemed to reside in the district within which it has the most significant contacts.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(d).

<sup>2</sup> *See* <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hra/help/adult-protective-services.page>.

Even though this Court may be an appropriate court to hear these claims, the Court may transfer claims “[f]or the convenience of the parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). “District courts have broad discretion in making determinations of convenience under Section 1404(a) and notions of convenience and fairness are considered on a case-by-case basis.” *D.H. Blair & Co. v. Gottdiener*, 462 F.3d 95, 106 (2d Cir. 2006). Moreover, courts may transfer cases on their own initiative. *See Cento v. Pearl Arts & Craft Supply Inc.*, No. 03-CV-2424 (LAK), 2003 WL 1960595, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 24, 2003) (“Courts have an independent institutional concern to see to it that the burdens of litigation that is unrelated to the forum that a party chooses are not imposed unreasonably on jurors and judges who have enough to do in determining cases that are appropriately before them. The power of district courts to transfer cases under Section 1404(a) *sua sponte* therefore is well established.”); *see also Lead Indus. Ass’n. Inc. v. OSHA*, 610 F.2d 70, 79 n.17 (2d Cir. 1979) (noting that the “broad language of 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) would seem to permit a court to order transfer *sua sponte*”).

In determining whether transfer is appropriate, courts consider the following factors: (1) the convenience of witnesses; (2) the convenience of the parties; (3) the locus of operative facts; (4) the availability of process to compel the attendance of the unwilling witnesses; (5) the location of relevant documents and the relative ease of access to sources of proof; (6) the relative means of the parties; (7) the forum’s familiarity with the governing law; (8) the weight accorded to the plaintiff’s choice of forum; (9) trial efficiency; and (10) the interest of justice, based on the totality of circumstances. *Keitt v. N.Y. City*, 882 F. Supp. 2d 412, 458-59 (S.D.N.Y. 2011); *see also N.Y. Marine and Gen. Ins. Co. v. LaFarge No. Am., Inc.*, 599 F.3d 102, 112 (2d Cir. 2010) (setting forth similar factors). A plaintiff’s choice of forum is accorded less deference where

plaintiff does not reside in the chosen forum and the operative events did not occur there. *See Iragorri v. United Tech. Corp.*, 274 F.3d 65, 72 (2d Cir. 2001).

Under § 1404(a), transfer appears to be appropriate in this case. The alleged underlying events occurred in Queens County, in the Eastern District of New York. In addition, it is likely that relevant documents and witnesses are located in that judicial district. Based on the totality of the circumstances, the Court concludes that it is in the interest of justice to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. *See* § 1404(a).

### **CONCLUSION**

The Clerk of Court is directed to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Whether Plaintiffs should be permitted to proceed further without prepayment of fees is a determination to be made by the transferee court. A summons shall not issue from this Court. This order closes this case.

The Court certifies, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppededge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiffs and note service on the docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 4, 2022  
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain  
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
Chief United States District Judge